



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,805	06/30/1999	RONNIE I. CHAIKEN	777.285US1	8333

27488 7590 10/02/2002

MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

STEELMAN, MARY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/343,805

Applicant(s)

CHAIKEN ET AL.

Examiner

Mary J. Steelman

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2002 & 4 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15&17-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15&17-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 12 August 2002 and the faxed supplement received 4 September 2002.
2. As per Applicant's request:

Claim 16 is canceled without prejudice.

The Specification has been amended as requested.

Claims 15, 22, 31, 35, and 38 have been amended.
3. Applicant's arguments filed on 12 August 2002 and 4 September 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. With regards to Applicant's Rejections of claims 19-30 under 35 U.S.C 101:

(A) With respect to the rejection of claims 19 – 30: Claim 19 recites stored data, not a data structure *per se*.

(B) Claims 25-30 recite a data structure that imparts a physical organization.

(C) Claims 19-24 are not recited in the abstract: recite a computer-readable medium storing an opcode field...operand field...size field...mode field...associated with an intermediate representation instruction, thereby describing an interrelationship. Applicant recites in re Lowry

Art Unit: 2122

(claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory).

(D) Claims 25-30 are not recited in the abstract, rather a computer readable medium storing...having a ...data structure. The data structures are interrelated...to model an intermediate representation... Claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships...

(E) Claim 24 (should be claim 25) recites a “computer readable medium having stored thereon a hierarchical data structure...” and is thus statutory.

(F) Claims 25-30 (should be 26-30) depend from claim 24 (should be claim 25) and therefore...believed to be statutory.

In response to (A) – (F):

As to the Rejections of claims 19-30 under 35 U.S.C. 101:

Applicant fails to point out the functionality of the data structure of claim 19. Examiner agrees that the data structure imparts a physical organization of the data therein. However, the data structure itself does nothing functional. It only holds data. To be functional the data structure must accomplish some type of action. See MPEP IV.A.1. (a) “Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional

Art Unit: 2122

interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized.”

Rejections of claims 1,2,6-9,11-13,15-18, 31-35, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Applicant has pointed out (page 6, line 26) that prior art disclosed a system that converts linked code into machine executable code compatible with a target one of a plurality of computer system hardware architectures. The subject matter referenced in the Argument, refers to Srivastava '539 output. While prior art outputs a uniform format, the claim language does not require a heterogeneous output.

Rejections of claims 3-5, 10, 14, 36-38, 42,43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

It is noted that Srivastava'539 has met the limitations of claims 1, 35, and 41 and therefore the dependent claims 3-5, 10, 14, 36-38, 42, 43 are also rejected.

The rejections that follow are identical to the First Action, submitted 22 April 2002.

Specification

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 19 – 30 are rejected under 35 USC because the claimed inventions are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As to claims 19 – 24, merely claimed as “A computer-readable medium” that merely stores a data structure comprising various fields, flags, and operands without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer (“acts”), then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured or to the computer. Thus, such “descriptive material”, non-functional descriptive material, that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. The purely non-functional descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture.

Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760. **In re Sarkar**, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978). *See Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions-Final Version*, page 10. *See M.P.E.P. PP 2106(IV)(B)(1)(b)*.

As to claims 25 – 30, merely claimed as “A computer-readable medium” that merely stores a data structure comprising various fields and pointers to other data structures without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing processes performed by the computer (“acts”), then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured or to the computer. Thus, such “descriptive material”, non-functional descriptive material, that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter. The purely non-functional

Art Unit: 2122

descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture.

Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760. **In re Sarkar**, 588 F.2d 1330, 1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978). *See Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions-Final Version*, page 10. *See M.P.E.P. PP 2106(IV)(B)(1)(b)*.

Claims 19 – 24 and 25 – 30 merely define a template for data structures and their contents. Because they are non-functional (without functional interrelationship) and do not comprise of any computing processing activity they are considered non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

8. Claims 1, 2, 6 - 9, 11 – 13, 15 - 18, 31 – 35, and 39 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srivastava, U.S. Patent 5966539. (Hereinafter **Srivastava539**.)

As to claim 1:

Srivastava539 discloses a computer system that translates and transforms a plurality of source code modules (Examiner considers modules to be equivalent to components.) into an intermediate representation, using a symbol table to resolve addressing issues, partitioning

blocks and procedures, analyzing the flow within and between program procedures, optimizing and producing platform specific executable code (See abstract on page 1.) and comprising:

“...obtaining a binary for a component...” (See fig. 3.) Binaries are input as executable code.

“...determining a plurality of basic blocks...” (See fig. 3.) Basic blocks are displayed at 101 – 103. Srivastava539 discloses (col. 4, line 67 – col. 5, line 1), “...procedures are organized into basic execution blocks...”

“...translating each...instruction...into an intermediate representation instruction...” (See fig. 3.) At step 52, code is translated into “register translation language” which as stated in col. 2, lines 53 – 55, “The register transfer language is independent of any particular computer system hardware architectures.” The Examiner considers “register transfer language” to be equivalent to “intermediate representation.”

“...determining a procedure...” In Fig. 3 and Col. 4, lines 63 – 64 Srivastava539 discloses, “The organizer 54 partitions the linked code 52 into a collection of procedures 100.”

“...creating an intermediate representation of the procedure...” Srivastava539 also discloses (col. 5, lines 7 – 10), “...procedure flow graphs (PFG)...the PFG maps the flow of control through the basic blocks...” Examiner interprets this as mapping the flow of instructions through the blocks comprising a procedure.

“...annotating the intermediate representation...with symbol information...” Srivastava539 also discloses (fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 39 – 41) “The intermediate representation of the program is in the form of the register transfer language and the logical symbol table 51”

Art Unit: 2122

“creating an intermediate representation of the component...” Srivastava539 also discloses (col. 5, lines 7 – 12), “The organizer builds...a program call graph (PCG)...The PCG indicates how the procedures are called by each other.” Also, col. 11, lines 60 – 61 state, “FIG. 8 shows a program having procedures 320-329 calling each other as defined by a program call graph...” Examiner considers groups of procedures calling each other to be equivalent to components.

Per claim 2:

“...creating an intermediate representation of the heterogeneous program from the intermediate representation of the component.” Srivastava539 also discloses (col. 4, lines 15 – 16), “A linker 50 embodying the invention can combine the object modules...” See the linker (50) in figs. 2 and 3. Note that the linker processes the intermediate representation.

Per claim 6:

“...symbol table...to define an address space” Srivastava539 also discloses, (col. 5, lines 21 – 22) “All symbolic addresses are resolved...” Figure 3, item 53 shows the logical symbol table, LST.

“...Translating...into a platform-specific” Srivastava539 also discloses, (col. 5, lines 20 – 21) “The code generator 57 generates machine-dependent code for the target hardware architecture.” Examiner considers platform-specific to be equivalent to machine-dependent code. Fig. 3, item 9, CPU Architecture Description is a collection of platform specific information.

Per claim 7:

Art Unit: 2122

“...Outputting the symbol information” Srivastava also discloses in Fig. 3 the LST outputting information to the organizer, item 54.

Per claim 8:

“...Outputting emitted block information” Srivastava also discloses in fig. 3, item 100, comprised of blocks, item 105, with an output to the code generator, item 57.

Per claim 9:

“...obtaining the emitted block information...” See fig. 3, item 100 for stored collection of blocks, 105 in the form of intermediate representation.

Per claim 11:

“...replacing ...platform-specific instruction with a platform-neutral...” Srivastava also discloses, (fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 41 – 48) “During an initial phase, the translator transforms the collection...The linked code module is in the form of an intermediate register transfer language...”

“...replicating a complex platform-specific instruction in an intermediate representation...” Srivastava⁵³⁹ also discloses, (Abstract, line 1) “A computer system is directed to convert a program written as a plurality of high level source code modules...” Examiner considers a plurality of high-level source code to be equivalent to complex platform-specific. See above for the treatment of converting platform specific to an intermediate representation.

Per claim 12:

“...intermediate representation of the program arranged in a hierarchy...” See fig. 3. Blocks are displayed as item 105, procedures are displayed as items 101 – 103, components, 100,

Art Unit: 2122

are created from the procedures and sent to the code generator. Instructions that have been processed by the translator are in the intermediate representation form.

Per claim 13:

“...code block element references...instruction for multiple instances of a platform-specific instruction...” See fig. 3. A code block as shown in item 100 references intermediate representation instructions for multiple instances of platform specific instruction. Later in the processing, the CPU Architecture Description, item 9, works with the Code Generator, item 57, to make code platform-specific.

Per claim 15:

“...a reader method comprising obtaining a binary for a component...”

“analyzing the binary...” and

“building an intermediate representation of a program...”

See response to claim 1 above. Also see figs. 2 and 3 where code is input, analyzed and built into an intermediate representation.

Per claim 16:

“...building an intermediate representation of a program...” See response above as disclosed by Srivastava539.

Per claim 17:

“...analyzing the binary...performing code discovery...determine a plurality of basic blocks...establishing block relationships...” See response above as disclosed by Srivastava539.

Also see fig. 4 and col. 9, lines 37 – 39 in which Srivastava539 discloses, “The basic blocks 151-

Art Unit: 2122

155 of the procedures 101-103 of the program 20 are repeatedly examined during successive passes...”

Per claim 18:

“...building the intermediate representation ...comprises translating every instruction...into an intermediate representation...” See response above. Fig. 2 shows the optimizing linker, which is further subdivided in fig. 3, items 51,52,53,54. In fig. 3, translated instructions are held in the RTL Program Module, item 52.

Per claim 31:

“A computerized system comprising: a processing unit; a system memory coupled to ...a bus; a translation and transformation system...translate a platform-specific binary into a plurality of intermediate representation instructions.” This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, in claim 1, wherein all claim limitations also have been disclosed and/or covered under the same cited areas as set forth above. Moreover, see Figs. 1-3. Thus, the same rationales provided in the rejection of claim 1 above is also applied and incorporated herein.

Per claim 32:

“Application program interface instructs the...system to further cause the processing unit to transform the plurality of intermediate representation instructions.” See figs. 1, 2 and 3. The analyzer further transforms the instructions as shown in figs. 4 and 5. Srivastava539 also discloses, (col. 13, lines 56 – 58) “The code generator, using the CPU description can produce machine executable code from the rearranged linked module.” Srivastava539’s system is

Art Unit: 2122

directed by a program (API) to process input by translation and transformation on a plurality of intermediate representation instructions. Fig. 9 shows additional optimizing transformations.

Per claim 33:

“...translation and transformation system further causes processing unit to translate...into a modified platform-specific binary.” Srivastava539 also addressed and /r covered such claimed limitations as set forth in claim 32 above.

Per claim 34:

“...processing unit to translate the modified platform-specific binary into a modified plurality of...instructions...” See fig. 3, items 9, 57 and 60. Srivastava539’s system translated the modified platform-specific binaries. A plurality of modified instructions is produced for further transformation.

Per claim 35:

“...translating a platform-specific binary into a plurality of intermediate representation instructions.” This is an apparatus version of the claimed system discussed above, in claim 34, wherein all claim limitations also have been disclosed and/or covered under the same cited areas as set forth above. Moreover, see Fig. 3, item 9, which shows a collection of platform-specific descriptions used in the translation. Thus, the same rationales provided in the rejection of claim 34 above is also applied and incorporated herein.

Per claim 39:

“...translating ...instructions into a new version of the platform specific binary.”

Srivastava539 discloses the new platform specific binaries in figs. 2 and 3, item 60. Col. 4, lines 21 – 22 state, “The linker produces machine dependent executable code 60 which can be

Art Unit: 2122

loaded in the memory 3 for subsequent execution by the CPU 2 of the computer system 1 of FIG.1”

Per claim 40:

“...translating the new version of the platform-specific binary into a new version of the plurality of intermediate representation instructions.” See fig. 3. By supplying the new version of platform-specific binary into the system at item 60, a new version of the plurality of intermediate representation instructions can be processed.

Per claim 41:

“...iterating an intermediate representation of a heterogeneous program...create a plurality of new versions...” This is an apparatus version of the claimed methods discussed above, wherein the claim limitations also have been disclosed and/or covered under the same cited areas as set forth above. Moreover, see Figs. 1-3 where multiple executions through the system can be used to create a plurality of new versions of the heterogeneous program. Thus, the same rationales provided in the rejections of the above claims is also applied and incorporated herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2122

10. Claims 3 – 5, 10, 36 – 38, 42, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava539, as applied to claims 1, 6, 35 and 41, respectively above, and further in view of Srivastava, U.S. Patent 5539907. (Hereinafter Srivastava907.)

As to claims 3, 10 and 36, as applied to claims 1, 6, and 35 respectively above:

Srivastava539 disclosed the claimed invention, as discussed above, except he did not explicitly disclose the concept of “*user input*” to affect control of the transformation and translation process. However, Srivastava907 discloses a translation program that includes instrumentation and monitoring by factoring in user input parameters. Srivastava907 (col. 6, lines 44 – 47) teaches, “Under the user’s direction, portions of the program to be monitored are identified by “navigating” through the program using the program and CPU description and the graphs.” Also, (col. 6, lines 62 - 64) teach, “The user supplied UIR [user instrumentation routines]...locate and modify specific portions ...” It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Srivastava907, by providing methods for user input, into the teachings of Srivastava539 (one or more iterations of translation and transformation of platform-specific heterogeneous programs, prior to creating new versions of the heterogeneous programs), in order to provide a more useful customized translation system, because user inputs can be used to obtain precise information reflecting the operation of the computer system.

As to claim 4, as applied to claim 3 above:

Srivastava539 does not teach the method of “instrumenting”. However, Srivastava907 teaches “*instrumenting*” as a means of monitoring control flow. Srivastava907 discloses, (Abstract, lined 10 – 12) “Fundamental instrumentation routines identify, locate, and modify

Art Unit: 2122

specific program components to be monitored.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Srivastava907, by including instrumentation routines, into Srivastava539 (methods of transforming intermediate representations of the program during the translation and transformation of heterogeneous programs), because by identifying and locating specific program components, the components can be modified to call user analysis routines, which may help to better optimize performance.

As to claim 5, as applied to claim 3:

Srivastava539 does not teach optimizing the intermediate representation of a program based on the “*user input*” limitation (which is addressed above in claim 3). However, Srivastava907 also teaches “...*optimizing the intermediate representation of the program...*” (See col. 3, lines 49 – 52), “Performance data can be used to optimize the design...” Also, (col. 3, lines 63 – 64) “It is desirable to monitor the execution of the program at the procedure, basic block, and instruction level.” Also, (col. 14, lines 13 – 16) “The common structures of programs to be identified and modified can be performed by fundamental instrumentation procedures.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Srivastava907, by optimizing the intermediate representation of a program based on user inputs, into Srivastava539 (methods of transforming intermediate representations of the program during the translation and transformation of heterogeneous programs), because optimization produces a faster, more efficient code, which will increase the performance of the program.

As to claim 37, as applied to claim 36 above:

“...translating the plurality of intermediate representation instructions...into a modified platform-specific binary” Srivastava539 also teaches and/or addresses the translation intermediate representation instructions into platform-specific binaries. See fig. 3. Intermediate representation instructions are held in item 52. From that point they are further processed into platform-specific binaries, using the CPU Architecture Description, item 19, as per the diagram. User input, item 9a, is a factor in the system. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to also implement the teachings of Srivastava539, to translate the plurality of intermediate representation instructions, into the combination of Srivastava539 and Srivastava907 (in accordance with, input parameters, as set forth in claim 36 above), because translating instructions into binaries that have been customized with user inputs can produce more specialized efficient program code, which will run faster on a specific computing system.

As per claim 38, as applied to claim 37 above:

“...translating the modified platform-specific binary into a modified plurality of intermediate representation instructions for further transactions.” Srivastava539 also discloses a method for translating the modified platform-specific binaries (See the Srivastava539 figs. 2 and 3.), but does not explicitly address doing this in accordance with user inputs as in claim 36. However, Srivastava907, of the combination of Srivastava539 and Srivastava907, also disclose *“user inputs”*, as set forth in claim 36 above. Thus, accordingly such claimed limitations would also have been obvious.

As per claims 42 and 43, as applied to claim 41:

“...manipulating the intermediate representation using data input...” and “terminating the iterating...based on data input...” Srivastava539 disclosed the claimed invention, as discussed above, except he did not explicitly disclose the concept of *“data input”* as input controlling of the transformation and translation process. However, Srivastava907 discloses a translation program that includes instrumentation and monitoring by factoring in data input. See figs. 3 and 4. Srivastava907 (col. 6, lines 66 - 67) teaches, “The user supplied UAR 49 are procedures for collecting and analyzing performance data.” Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the teachings of Srivastava907, by using data input, to the one or more iterations, and termination, of translation and transformation of platform-specific heterogeneous programs, into Srivastava539, in order to increase optimization, because data inputs can be used to alter the code sequence for the purpose of ultimately producing faster platform-specific executable code.

11. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava539, as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of common knowledge in computer art.

As per claim 14:

“...associating a hash value...so that...instructions hash to the hash value.”

Srivastava539 does not explicitly address hash values. Official notice is taken that a hash table and associated hash values are well known in the computer art as a common means of indexing into a collection of data and/or code. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to also utilize a hash table feature to position instructions in a collection allowing quick access by an index value, for the purpose of streamlining program organization.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2122

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(A) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Steelman, whose telephone number is (703) 305-4564. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 7:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789.

The fax phone numbers are (703) 746-7240 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

MS



09/26/2002



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100